

Minutes of the May 06, 2015 Administrative Review Hearing, held in the Weber County Planning Division Office, 2380 Washington Blvd., Suite 240, Ogden UT, commencing at 4:00 p.m.

Staff Present: Jim Gentry, Ronda Kippen, Kary Serrano, Chad Meyerhoffer, Engineering Department

Others Present: Cecil Satterthwaite, Item #1
Craig Bachman, Item #2; Jason Peterson, Item #2
Alan Trust, Item #4
Amy Kap, Item #6; Hollis Jencks, #6

1. Consideration and action on an administrative application for final plat approval of Liberty Meadows Subdivision 2nd Amendment, located at approximately 3500 East 3600 North, Eden, UT; Lynn C. and Melanie C. Satterthwaite, Applicants; Cecil Satterthwaite, Authorized Agent.
Ronda Kippen said since there is no one to contest, this application stands approved and signed by the Planning Director.
2. Consideration and action on an administrative application for final plat approval of Green Hill Country Estates Phase 6, a Cluster Subdivision, 1st Amendment, located at approximately 1176 North Maple Drive; Faith Hope Bachman, Applicant; Jason Peterson Authorized Agent
Ronda Kippen said she did receive one letter from the HOA with their understanding; this was a division of property and not a modification of the lot. They requested that this letter be kept on file to clarify that subdividing is not allowed stated by Brian See from the HOA. They do not have a problem with the proposed modification. Since there is no one to contest, this application stands approved and signed by the Planning Director.
3. Consideration and action on an administrative application for final plat approval of Ortberg Subdivision, located at approximately 3936 North 2975 West; James and Jeannine K. Ortberg, Applicants
Ronda Kippen said since there is no one to contest, this application stands approved and signed by the Planning Director.
4. Consideration and action on an access exception for two lots on access easements at approximately 5599 East Highway 39, Allen Trust, Applicant; Zane Froerer, Authorized Agent
Jim Gentry said he received a call from an adjacent property owner, and he would like to make it as part of their requirement, that at the time they do construction and they damage the access into the right-of-way, that they repair it to what it was. If that is agreeable, this item stand approved.
6. Consideration and action on an administrative application, of Debra Robinson Subdivision Phase 3, 1-lot including a recommendation for a deferral of curb, gutter, and sidewalk, located at approximately 766 North 4400 West; Debra Robinson, Applicant; Amy Kap, Authorized Agent
Jim Gentry said there will also be a substandard road agreement as well as other agreement. They are waiting for a letter from the Corp of Engineers releasing that and once it's done. Hollis Jencks made a reference to the violation and Mr. Gentry suggested working with Iris Hennon or the Director, Sean Wilkinson to clear the violation, so he could record the subdivision. The Engineering Department, Dana Shuler has signed the plat with a request that it not be recorded until the violation was cleared. With that condition, this items stands approved.
5. Consideration and action on an administrative application, Amending Big Sky Estates No. 1 (Lot 44) Subdivision including vacating the 20 foot drainage easement and a recommendation for a deferral of curb, gutter, and sidewalk, located at approximately 4075 East Blue Bell Drive; Diane Lindquist, Applicant; Russ Watts, Authorized Agent
Jim Gentry said that he had received two calls. One call from Wallis Horton, an adjacent property owner, and Mr. Gentry showed him the subdivision plat and where the new drainage easement is going to be located. Mr. Horton said that he had no concerns. He received an email from Kenny and Sarah Mumford, who opposes the removal of the drainage easement. A copy of this letter has been sent to the Planning Director, Sean Wilkinson, and to Jared Andersen, County Engineer and Chad Meyerhoffer, Engineering Department. Mr. Meyerhoffer is here to address this drainage easement and address the letter and concerns of this homeowner.

Chad Meyerhoffer said the biggest thing they have is the impact of this drainage easement in the new location that could impact the existing home there. After looking at it, they do not feel that it will impact it, and right now there isn't a good define drainage up there on-site. It was looked at as far as taking that drainage easement down one of the property lines, either the north property line or that southern property line, and it was decided to go on the southern property line. The reason for that is they wanted to have that point discharge to remain the same as what it is on the plat. By going down the northern property line which would be better as far as the drainage but it couldn't get back to the point discharge.

Chad Meyerhoffer said that in reviewing the letter, there are a few things that the Mumford's make reference to, as far as some of the topographical survey being done on the property. They have some that connect on their property that differs by 50 feet in difference. He wouldn't mind getting some of that information from them if they do have it. So other than that with respect to the applicant; and have the opportunity to address this to ensure this drainage, and how they will deal with it so it doesn't impact the lot.

Jim Gentry asked in your explanation of everything, was Jared Andersen, County Engineer concurrent with your conclusions on this. Mr. Meyerhoffer replied in speaking with him, he did think it would be nicer for that easement to go along the northern property line, but in their discussions he wanted to keep that point discharge the same as where it is, and by going along that north property, they could get that water back out, and that what why it was determined to go out that south property. He felt that it still could be accomplished with all the drainage on this road they could still make it same either way. The only thing he could think of that might appease the property owners to the other side, is to have the applicant dig a drainage ditch along the front to ensure if any water comes down gets into that new drainage easement. When he was over there, there was no evidence of anything as far as sheet flow, there is no divided channels.

Jim Gentry asked if the property sloped towards the Mumford's adjacent property. Mr. Meyerhoffer replied that this is a slope analysis that was submitted to them by the applicant and it's being contested by the Mumford's, in that they are not in agreement with this data. On this data it does show that drainage on those arrows, and it would be coming off of their property and on to this property.

Jim Gentry asked so it's not sloping towards their property and forcing the drainage at this point based on the information and would it be wise to build a drainage ditch or culvert to define that channel on the front. Mr. Meyerhoffer replied yes, but it may or may not help, but if it is a concern for the Mumford's, if that would help appease them to know that any drainage that is coming off of cul-de-sac, it would get into that drainage, and it would be diverted from their home, it may help the homeowner to the north.

Jim Gentry said could you make that part of your recommendation. Mr. Meyerhoffer replied yes. Mr. Gentry said with that recommendation, the amending Big Sky Estates No. 1 (Lot 44) vacating the easement will stand approved with that condition.

7. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m. but in their discussion

Respectfully Submitted,



Kary Serrano, Secretary
Weber County Planning Division